

**NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION**  
To be cited only in accordance with FED. R. APP. P. 32.1

**United States Court of Appeals**  
**For the Seventh Circuit**  
**Chicago, Illinois 60604**

Submitted February 16, 2024\*  
Decided February 20, 2024

**Before**

MICHAEL Y. SCUDDER, *Circuit Judge*

THOMAS L. KIRSCH II, *Circuit Judge*

DORIS L. PRYOR, *Circuit Judge*

No. 23-3190

ANTOINETTE C. SELLERS,  
*Plaintiff-Appellant,*

*v.*

CITY OF CHICAGO DIVISION OF  
UNEMPLOYMENT, et al.,  
*Defendants-Appellees.*

Appeal from the United States District  
Court for the Northern District of  
Illinois, Eastern Division.

No. 23-cv-03750

Nancy L. Maldonado,  
*Judge.*

---

\* The Appellees were not served with process and are not participating in this appeal. We have agreed to decide the case without oral argument because the appeal is frivolous. FED. R. APP. P. 34(a)(2)(A).

**ORDER**

Antoinette Sellers believes she was improperly denied unemployment benefits under the Pandemic Unemployment Assistance program established by the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Sellers first sued in state court but did not obtain relief. She later filed a complaint and then an amended complaint in federal court against various city and state entities (which do not appear to exist), asserting breach of contract and negligence in connection with her unpaid benefits. The district court screened both complaints, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a), and dismissed them without prejudice, explaining that (1) the court lacked jurisdiction to decide her claims to the extent they challenged the state-court decision or were based on state law; (2) she had not named any suable entities; and (3) she did not plead facts that could plausibly support her claims. Sellers again amended her complaint, which the court dismissed for the same reasons. The court then gave Sellers a final opportunity to amend her complaint once more, warning Sellers that her failure to do so by the court's deadline would result in dismissal of her case. After Sellers missed the deadline, the court dismissed the case.

Sellers has filed an appellate brief that does not engage the district court's reasoning. The brief hardly engages the topics of this case at all; it primarily discusses healthcare insurance. Although we construe pro se briefs generously, an appellate brief must contain a discernible argument with citations to supporting authority. *See* FED. R. APP. P. 28(a)(8)(A); *Anderson v. Hardman*, 241 F.3d 544, 545 (7th Cir. 2001).

We close by reminding Sellers, consistent with our recent warning in *Sellers v. Howlett*, No. 23-2417, 2024 WL 399068, at \*1 (7th Cir. Feb. 2, 2024), that further frivolous appeals may result in sanctions against her, including fines that, if unpaid, may result in a bar on filing papers in any court within this circuit. *See Support Sys. Int'l, Inc. v. Mack*, 45 F.3d 185, 186 (7th Cir. 1995).

**DISMISSED**